Walls generally, and depth below lowest floor.—This is an unnecessary interference, which would not be certainly efficient for the purposes proposed, and would involve vexatious interference.

Part 2.—*External Walls.*—It is suggested that recesses may be allowed to be made in all stories that are above one story above the ground, nor would any evil result if, in case of building two stories only above the ground, these should be allowed to be carried through both stories.

Part 2.—*Brestsummers.*—The whole of this appears objectionable, and, in the opinion of your committee, ought to be left to the security the public enjoy, from its being the private interest of the parties building to make them efficient, and particularly ought not to be subject to the dictation of the surveyor, who, for his own security, will be obliged to impose an unnecessary degree of strength, and, as before stated, it is not right that the power of law should be given to the opinion of an individual.

Part 2.—*External Walls as Party Walls.*—The provision of present Act should be continued, that if 14 in. from top to bottom and sound, the wall might be allowed to stand,

Part 3.—*Party Walls—Division of Buildings.* A.—It is suggested that this should not have a retrospective operation.

Part 3.—*Site of Walls.*—Provision should be made in this for the payment of the additional brickwork as well as for the site.

Schedule D, Part 3.—*Construction and Materials.*—The object of this appears to be the exclusion of bond timber from the centre of party-walls; but the words do not clearly convey this. Your committee are of opinion that this regulation would be a wise one, and they recommend that this should be made clear. In all other respects this clause appears unnecessary, and going into details which would involve vexatious interference, and is sufficiently provided for by the former provisions of this schedule.

Openings in Party Walls.—This provision should be extended to all rates of buildings, and, under the restrictions here imposed, could involve no public risk.

Part 6.—*Party Fence Walls.*—This is altogether a matter not involving public right, and might be well omitted.

Schedule E.—The regulation of height of wooden shop-fronts appears unnecessary.

Schedule F.—*Construction of Chimneys.* Page 73.—It is submitted that the limitation of chimneys and chimney-backs as existing in the present Act has been found a sufficient security against fire, and if it be deemed imperative to have some more definite regulation, there is no necessity to compel the chimneys of the upper floors to be brought, as to their projections and the inconvenience of it, through the more important floors below.

Schedule E. — *Slate.*—Cement should be allowed.

Schedule H.—*Cesspools and Privies.* Page 76.—It is suggested that all this had better be omitted, because if a sewer is within reach, it would be in most cases better to have no cesspool. The whole of this clause has more the aspect of the description of a specification than the general provision of a legislative enactment.

Schedule M, page 79, affords a good illustration of the clear and lucid arrangement which pervades this Bill. It is a tabular view of the various acts to be done, notices to be given, &c., and will be found a most useful guide when the Bill shall become the law of the land.

Upon the whole, your committee are of opinion that the great amount of skill and labour which has been called into requisition in this matter, has produced the result which might have been anticipated; and that we may expect to have for our guidance an intelligible and wise enactment, which cannot but be a great advantage to all who will have so much to do with its practical effects and operation.

THOMAS PIPER, JUN., Hon. Sec.

Freemasons' Tavern, April, 1844.

Alterations in the Thicknesses of Walls, under the Proposed New Building Act, suggested by the Building Society, viz. half a brick less in the stories marked A.